

# Arts Education in Schools: Private Foundations and Public Responsibility

Stephen Mark Dobbs\*

The arts play an essential role in reflecting the heritage and transmitting the culture of society. As a result, advocates often urge arts education in the public schools as a method of fostering understanding and appreciation of the arts. Although the public appears to support the goals of arts education, government at all levels often cannot or will not provide the resources to establish and maintain quality programs. Advocates therefore often rely upon the private sector, especially foundations, to establish and fund such programs. Historically, philanthropic organizations often have played this role, a fact which Congress uses to justify allowing such organizations tax-exempt status.

This Article argues, however, that the private sector cannot and should not be the primary source of funds and resources for arts education. Private foundations, by their very nature, are equipped to play only a limited role in the establishment and maintenance of arts programs in schools. Foundations best serve the goals of the private and public sectors when they act chiefly as catalysts and risk-takers in helping to build, supplement, and enrich arts programs to which public schools make a permanent commitment. An arts education effort must center on the support and commitment by the public sector, and public schools themselves must assume the ultimate responsibility for these programs, which are so important to children's general education.

This Article begins with a brief analysis of the process of change in American education, in which advocates for subject areas such as art and music lobby and compete for resources from the local school boards who determine the curriculum taught to America's 46 million school children. It next examines the historical and political background of arts education in American schools. Although polls show that it has wide public support, arts education usually exists on

---

\* Chief Executive Officer and Executive Director, The Koret Foundation; Former Senior Program Officer, The Getty Center for Education in the Arts, an operating entity of the J. Paul Getty Trust; Professor of Creative Arts, San Francisco State University (on leave). The author wishes to acknowledge the helpful comments on earlier drafts of this article by Leilani Lattin Duke, Linda P. Pinkerton, and Jerry Travis.

the margins of the academic program and has had only limited success in developing a supportive constituency among education policymakers. Arts educators and their advocates thus are led to seek private sector funding, including foundation support. After setting forth a brief history of foundations in the area of arts education, this Article presents the experiences of the Getty Center for Education in the Arts as a case study of private sponsorship. The Getty Center works in partnership with other private and public groups to stimulate dialogue and strengthen advocacy for arts education, and works directly with schools to change the way they support and teach art. The Article then examines some policy issues surrounding private foundation support for arts education, including the effect on the public of substituting private funds for public monies and the internal limits on private sector support, especially by private foundations.

The Article concludes with recommendations for the ways in which the public and private sectors can work together to achieve mutual goals for arts education. I argue that a private foundation should act as a coordinating entity, which helps to establish a program and provides initial funding, with an explicit understanding that the public sector will steadily increase its funding and control of the project, eventually assuming direct and permanent responsibility for the provision of arts education in the schools.

### *I. The Process of Change in American Education*

The U.S. Constitution makes no express provision for the establishment and maintenance of educational systems. It reserves to the states "[t]he powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States."<sup>1</sup> Thus educational policymaking, upon which the quality and the content of the school curriculum depends, results from the decentralized and autonomous actions of fifty states. Although the United States Department of Education plays a national role, its power essentially is limited to the extent to which it can influence Congressional allocation of federal funds. Policymaking is decentralized even on the state level; while each state has a superintendent and a board of education, those bodies are restricted in their reach. In fact, the greatest policymaking power resides in the nation's 16,000 local school boards,

---

1. U.S. Const. amend. X.

which determine the structure, content, and operation of public education.<sup>2</sup>

The diversity and complexity of America's political and social fabric pose formidable challenges to those who desire change in the policy making process. Powerful teachers' unions, the professoriate in teacher education institutions, and special interest groups promoting various subject area interests all lend their weight (or inertia) to the change process. In addition, cycles of change occur on the policy landscape about every twenty years, usually accompanied by a spate of commission studies and reports.<sup>3</sup> Well-publicized books by authors such as Mortimer Adler, Ernest Boyer, John Goodlad and TheodoreSizer echo some of the most recent prescriptions for improving American education.<sup>4</sup> The aggregate of changes sought by all of these groups and movements literally would revolutionize the curriculum, the preparation of teachers, the administration and financing of schools, and the delivery of instruction to American students.

In determining educational policy, the most important and controversial question school boards face is that of curriculum content. In recent years the tides of various curricular reforms have swept

---

2. It is not only the size of the American educational system that makes it difficult to reach consensus on educational goals and methods. Japan concentrates its educational policymaking in a cabinet-level ministry; although local and regional bodies have input, the centralization of authority obviously facilitates the spread of change in the system. Soramoto, Educational Administration of Japan, 2 Educ. in Japan: J. for Overseas 103, 105-06 (1967). One of the major reports on American school reform notes that Japan, among other industrial democracies, is surpassing the United States in some areas of education. The National Commission on Excellence in Education, *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform, A Report to the Nation and the Secretary of Education*, U.S. Department of Education 6-7 (1983) [hereinafter *A Nation at Risk*]. Yet the centralized policymaking structure which underlies Japanese education's efficiency and productivity would likely be anathema to Americans, since states and local school districts zealously guard their autonomy and policymaking authority.

3. For example, in 1983 alone, a Presidential panel, the Business-Higher Education Forum, the College Board, the Economic Commission of the States, and the Twentieth Century Fund, among others, published national studies. See, e.g., *A Nation at Risk*, *supra* note 2; College Entrance Examination Board, *Academic Preparation for College: What Students Need to Know and Be Able to Do* (1983) [hereinafter *Academic Preparation for College*]; Business-Higher Education Forum, *America's Competitive Challenge: The Need for a National Response, A Report to the President of the United States* (1983); Economic Commission of the States, *Action for Excellence: A Comprehensive Plan to Improve Our Nation's Schools, Report of the Task Force on Education for Economic Growth* (1983); Twentieth Century Fund, *Making the Grade, Report of the Task Force on Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Policy* (1983).

4. M. Adler, *The Paideia Proposal: An Educational Manifesto* (1982); E. Boyer, *High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America, A Report from the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching* (1983); J. Goodlad, *A Place Called School: Prospects for the Future, A Report of the Study of Schooling* (1984); T.Sizer, *Horace's Compromise: The Dilemma of the American High School* (1984).

the nation; these reforms include the "back to basics" movement, the emphasis on critical and higher order "thinking skills," and the current focus on "cultural literacy." Each of the subject area interest groups competing for instructional attention and resources attempts to capitalize upon these reform themes, finding in them further justification for the contributions made by that subject area to the goals of general education. Professional organizations of specialists, professors in the respective disciplines, and bureaucrats struggle to maintain and increase their respective shares of the curricular pie. One of the cardinal rules of curriculum reform is that when something is added to the school program, whether it be a new course in computers, or drug education, or an expanded role for a traditional subject area, something else must be removed.<sup>5</sup>

Educational policymakers such as school boards, superintendents, and school principals have become accustomed to "campaigns" waged by advocates of different subject matter interests. A flood of publications, conferences, and carefully designed presentations (often accompanied by impressive audiovisual backup) reflects the dedication of the advocates and the fierceness of their push for resources. These advocates enlist allies wherever possible, especially from the community, civic, and private sectors where educational policymakers have significant contacts and alliances. Educational advocates may target private foundations, along with other potential sources, to support specific subject areas of the curriculum.

## *II. Arts Education in American Schools*

Arts education has been and continues to be a recurring subject of curricular debate. As a result, its position in American schools is precarious. The arts traditionally have not enjoyed the same privileged position in general education as the academic core curriculum of language, mathematics, social studies and science. Subjects such as art and music usually have subsisted at the periphery of school programs because educational policymakers perceive the arts as extracurricular, recreational, and therapeutic subjects.

Historically, proponents have tried to ameliorate some of the antipathy towards arts education by offering utilitarian or instrumental

---

5. A Nation at Risk recommends that the American school day be lengthened to seven hours and that the school year be extended to 200-220 days to accommodate the growing number of demands on instructional time. The average American student currently attends school six hours per day, 180 days per year. A Nation at Risk, *supra* note 2, at 21, 29-30.

## Arts Education in Schools

rationales for art's place in the curriculum. For example, members of the Boston School Board returned from London's Great Exhibition in 1851 impressed with the high quality of the European nations' design and manufacturing industries. They attributed the success of these industries in part to the inclusion of a drawing curriculum in European schools, which helped prepare drafters and designers for mills and factories. Accordingly, these mid-nineteenth century educational policymakers regarded the teaching of drawing to children as a valuable investment in New England's fast-growing industrial economy.<sup>6</sup>

In addition to the economic and social value of arts education, educators and policymakers began to recognize a moral and expressive value in the teaching of the arts. A desire for cultural refinement led to the study of pictures in schools, as well as to the establishment of American art museums. With the advent of the Child Study Movement at the turn of the century, concern for children's psychological growth led to the belief that arts education could help foster self-expression and creativity. Today, many art educators justify arts education with a utilitarian or instrumentalist rationale that ties art to the attainment of essentially personal and social educational goals.

Despite an appreciation by some educators and policymakers of the value of an arts education, the primary intellectual mission of American schools has been to teach children language skills and mathematics. Because some perceive arts education as relevant only to the emotional and psychological well-being of children, rather than to the training of their intellects, many schools exclude arts education from the core curriculum. The almost exclusive emphasis on studio techniques and materials at the secondary level (e.g., learning about art media and how to fashion imagery) and the holiday-centered art curriculum of thousands of American schools at the elementary level (e.g., Thanksgiving turkeys, valentines, etc.) has reinforced the damaging perception of art education as a non-intellectual relief from the pressures of the core curriculum.

---

6. Foster Wygant documents the origins of art education along the lines of the industrial rationale in American schools. F. Wygant, *Art in American Schools in the Nineteenth Century* (1983). There were also home and community-based activities through which young people could acquire the skills needed for careers in art, such as in the new commercial field of advertising which developed along with high speed printing and magazines in the nineteenth century. See D. Korzenik, *Drawn to Art: A Nineteenth-Century American Dream* (1985).

The educational reform literature of the 1960s and 1970s, which often promoted art as necessary for children's growth and development because of the lack of sufficient opportunities for "affect" in classrooms, unwittingly reinforced this view of the arts as "tender-hearted" and the academic curriculum as "hard-headed."<sup>7</sup> Furthermore, misconceptions among administrators about artistic learning have reinforced the notion that the arts are not a means to achieve the most important educational goals. Some arts educators themselves have contributed to the low status of arts education in schools by cloaking their subject in mystique and esoterica.

However, not all educators have shared this view of the arts' marginal relevance. Over fifty years ago, John Dewey argued that the intellectual demands of art are equal to those involved in the practice of the sciences. He suggested that the artist, in pursuing strategies for conception and execution of works of art, exercises what art educators subsequently called a "qualitative" intelligence.<sup>8</sup> Subsequent empirical studies have stressed the "cognitive approach" to art and its potential role in the development of critical thinking skills.<sup>9</sup> Howard Gardner writes that children need a broader range of educational encounters in school, including exposure to symbol systems such as those that exist in works of art. Such systems furnish knowledge that is submerged or not otherwise available in the discursive curriculum that traditionally dominates formal learning.<sup>10</sup>

Long ago, Plato observed that what society honors, it will cultivate. The historic lack of status for art education suggests that educational policymakers have never felt any particular pressure from

---

7. For examples of the reform literature, and especially of the educational romanticism characteristic of advocates of curricular experimentation and organizational change, see G. Dennison, *The Lives of Children: The Story of the First Street School* (1969); J. Herndon, *The Way It Spozed To Be* (1968); H. Kohl, *The Open Classroom: A Practical Guide to a New Way of Teaching* (1969); J. Kozol, *Free Schools* (1972); C. Murrow & L. Murrow, *Children Come First: The Inspired Work of English Primary Schools* (1971); N. Postman & C. Weingarter, *Teaching as a Subversive Activity* (1969).

8. J. Dewey, *Art as Experience* (1934). Later philosophers also have argued for the seminal role of images and image-making in the processes of thinking and language development. See H. Broudy, *The Role of Imagery in Learning* (The Getty Center for Education in the Arts, 1987); *The Arts, Cognition, and Basic Skills* (S. Madeja ed. 1978).

9. This emphasis began with the works of R. Arnheim, *Art and Visual Perception: A Psychology of the Creative Eye* (1954). In the last 25 years the most consistent effort to systematically probe the links between creativity and comprehension has been the Harvard Graduate School of Education's "Project Zero," founded by Nelson Goodman and now co-directed by Howard Gardner and David Perkins. Gardner is a leading exponent of the cognitive approach. For articles by Gardner and others on the cognitive approach, see generally 36:2 *Art Educ.* (Mar. 1983). See also E. Eisner, *Cognition and Curriculum: A Basis for Deciding What to Teach* (1982).

10. H. Gardner, *Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences* (1983).

## Arts Education in Schools

the public to develop a curriculum in art beyond the basics of studio art. However, when people are asked in public opinion polls whether they think the arts are important, and whether they would like to see more arts education in the schools, the consensus is strongly affirmative.<sup>11</sup> Recent reports on school reform also reveal ample support for a strengthened role for the arts in the curriculum. For example, the College Board states that "the basic academic subjects" should include the arts as one of the core courses of study in the curriculum.<sup>12</sup> Such reports add popular support to the advocacy movement, which has gathered steam over recent years. The populist sentiment for reform in arts education in the schools was also reflected by a vocal and highly visible Secretary of Education, William Bennett. His reports during the Reagan Administration championed literacy and a core curriculum that includes the arts.<sup>13</sup> As Bennett said in 1987:

Great works of art form an incomparable record of our past, the evolution of our society. . . they are among the finest expressions of the values we cherish as a people . . . . [Art] provides us with some of our most salient examples of the breadth and depth and complexity of human nature. And art, no less than philosophy and science, issues a challenge to the intellect.<sup>14</sup>

However, supporters of expanded arts education have had limited success in persuading educational policymakers to give art a larger role in the curriculum. According to a report prepared by the National Endowment for the Arts, a large gap exists "between commitment and resources for arts education *and* the actual practice of arts education in classrooms."<sup>15</sup> In the 1970s, a number of task forces

---

11. L. Harris et al., *Americans and the Arts V* (National Research Center of the Arts, 1988). See also Sharbutt, *Arts Poll: Less Participation, More Interest*, Los Angeles Times, Mar. 16, 1988, § 6, at 1. The Louis Harris poll found that public interest in the arts is "staggeringly higher than anyone ever dared imagine." 91% of those polled replied that it is important for school-age children to be exposed to the arts, with 55% saying they didn't think the children in their community had "enough opportunity" to have cultural experiences. 81% approved of children learning to draw, paint or sculpt.

12. Academic Preparation for College, *supra* note 3, at 13.

13. See W. Bennett, *First Lessons: A Report on Elementary Education in America* 35-36 (1986); W. Bennett, *James Madison High School: A Curriculum for American Studies* 41-42 (1987).

14. W. Bennett, *Discipline-Based Art Education: What Forms Will It Take?* 30-41 (The Getty Center for Education in the Arts, 1987).

15. National Endowment for the Arts, *Toward Civilization: A Report on Arts Education* (1988). This report was prepared in response to a call by the 99th Congress, in 1985, for "a study of the state of arts and humanities education in public elementary and secondary schools" as part of the reauthorization of the National Endowment for the Arts. H. R. Rep. No. 274, 99th Cong., 1st Sess. 102, 105 (1985). For an earlier response to Congressional concerns about arts education, see I. Clarke, *Art and Industry*,

and national studies documented the status and character of arts education in American schools.<sup>16</sup> A recent reassessment continues to paint a bleak picture.<sup>17</sup> At the state level, only 29 states have enacted a high school graduation requirement that includes the arts, and in many instances the requirement is relaxed. For example, in many states, a course in foreign language, vocational education, or computer technology may satisfy the arts requirement.<sup>18</sup> Additionally, the lack of professional preparation in art education of most elementary school teachers and the significant variance of the schools' access to art specialists indicate the status of arts education in the schools.

Public sector policymaking for arts education is principally in the hands of school boards and public agencies such as the National Endowment for the Arts. Both groups have been widely criticized for what some believe are modest results. For example, one author suggests that even after the expenditure of millions of dollars the Endowment has not created any noteworthy advances in public school arts programs.<sup>19</sup> Another writer believes that it is necessary "that the Endowment learn to think educationally and not confuse patronage, revenue sharing, and show business with teaching and learning."<sup>20</sup> However, there are encouraging signs that the Arts Endowment is making a policy shift towards substantive programs that more fully reflect the diverse needs of the field of arts education.<sup>21</sup>

---

Industrial and High Art Education in the United States, Part I, Drawing in High Schools (1885).

16. The best-known of these was Arts, Education, and Americans Panel, *Coming to Our Senses: The Significance of the Arts for American Education* (1977). The widely-read report chronicled the low status of arts education in schools and proposed a variety of initiatives for improving the role and status of arts education, including greater use of artists from the community.

17. C. Fowler, *Can We Rescue the Arts for America's Children? Coming to Our Senses—10 Years Later* (American Council for the Arts, 1988). This report is the sequel to *Coming to our Senses*, *supra* note 16.

18. *Toward Civilization*, *supra* note 15, at 22; *see also infra* note 42.

19. R. Berman, *Culture and Politics* ch.11 (1984).

20. Smith, *Policy for Arts Education: Whither the Schools, Whither the Public and Private Sectors?* 89:4 *Design for Arts in Educ.* 2, 7 (Mar./Apr. 1988). Another potential pitfall is that the Endowment relies on state art agencies to accomplish educational tasks. Some believe these tasks would be better fulfilled by state departments of education, teacher training institutions, and the schools.

21. Frank Hodsoll, the former chairman of the Endowment, succeeded in breaking the virtual monopoly enjoyed by the artists-in-residency program, which left little or no funds for other arts initiatives in schools. The National Endowment for the Arts (N.E.A.) has now committed itself to a broader view, including grants for curriculum-based instruction and support of research in arts education through the establishment of centers at New York University and the University of Illinois. Hodsoll, *Some Thoughts on Art Education*, 26:4 *Stud. in Art Educ.* 247 (Summer 1985). Also, the arts education



## Arts Education in Schools

Despite such encouraging signs, commitment by public schools to substantive arts education remains low. Although the public appears to support arts education, that support has not been effectively translated into educational programs. This failure may be due, in part, to a lack of funds for such programs or to a reluctance to commit available public funds. Schools, therefore, often turn to the private sector for the support it offers in many instances when public commitment fails.

### *III. Foundation Support for Arts Education*

Proponents in schools, teacher education institutions, museums, community and cultural arts organizations, and professional associations have underscored the importance of public and private sector groups working together to further the cause of arts education. Their activities have highlighted the role of the private foundation, which traditionally has supported the arts in communities, and arts education programs in schools indirectly through the sponsorship of local and national arts organizations such as Young Audiences.

Some of the largest foundations, such as Carnegie, Ford, Mellon, and Rockefeller, traditionally have funded a wide array of educational enterprises, both in elementary and secondary schools as well as in higher education. Significant support for arts in schools funded by private foundations began in the 1960s, concomitant with the establishment of the National Endowment for the Arts in 1965 under Johnson-era legislation.<sup>22</sup> A handful of private foundations followed the Endowment's lead. For example, an "arts in education" program sponsored by John D. Rockefeller III supported projects such as the effort at Bank Street College in New York City. Through techniques of staff development and curriculum implementation in both the visual and performing arts, the Bank Street project tried to effect a renaissance for the arts in a small public elementary school on the West Side of Manhattan.<sup>23</sup> In another example of early private foundation support, the Charles F. Kettering Foundation sponsored a three-year curriculum development project at Stanford

---

program within the N.E.A. was the only one to be recommended for a substantial increase (from \$5.6 million to \$6.6 million) in the FY90 federal budget. Marks, 19 Arts Reporting Service 3 (March 27, 1989).

22. National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, Pub. L. No. 89-209, § 5 (a)-(d)(1), (e)-(l), 79 Stat. 846 (1965).

23. G. Klopff, M. Steinway, A. Shapiro & S. Dobbs, *The Arts and the School: A Program for Integrating the Arts in an Elementary School* (Oct. 1971) (unpublished final report) (report available from author).

University. This project provided elementary school students with a multifaceted course of study in the domains of art criticism and art history as well as in art production, which has traditionally dominated the art curriculum.<sup>24</sup>

Despite the involvement of a few foundations, most of the major initiatives for arts education throughout the 1970s came from the federal Office of Education and through various titles of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965.<sup>25</sup> States and local school districts received substantial categorical funds for arts projects under ESEA Titles I, III, and IV. However, when these monies became discretionary upon the repeal of ESEA in 1978, the arts seldom survived as a priority.<sup>26</sup> In addition, declining school enrollments and inflation added to the challenge, leading arts educators to seek new alliances to fight for art programs.<sup>27</sup>

---

24. Eisner, Curriculum Making for the Wee Folk: Stanford University's Kettering Project, 9:3 *Stud. in Art Educ.* 45 (Spring 1968). The curriculum was built upon the assumption that children should acquire an array of skills through communication about works of art. Building children's knowledge about art, especially their art vocabulary, allows them to effectively share what they see and think about works of art and their creation of art. The Kettering Curriculum Model also holds that students need to learn about the context in which works of art are created and function and their role in culture and history.

It was fairly novel in the late 1960s to suggest that even young children could find educational profit in such areas, but today virtually every state framework and curriculum guide postulates art history or cultural heritage as a key element of content for students of all ages. See, e.g., California State Department of Education, Visual and Performing Arts Framework for California Public Schools: Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve (1982) [hereinafter Visual and Performing Arts Framework].

25. Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, 20 U.S.C. §§ 241(a) et seq., repealed by Pub. L. No. 95-561, § 101(c), 92 Stat. 2200 (1978). Authority and responsibility for arts education shifted from the U.S. Department of Education to the National Endowment for the Arts in 1986, strengthening Chairman Frank Hodsoll's efforts to create an expanded and more diversified thrust for arts education by the N.E.A. In response to state arts councils, the Endowment historically has favored artists-in-schools residency programs, excluding other priorities voiced by arts educators themselves. More recently, the N.E.A. has shifted some of the modest resources it provides for arts education, which total approximately \$5 million overall, to a program which seeks to stimulate the development of curriculum-based programs, such as those advocated in the Toward Civilization report. See Toward Civilization, *supra* note 15.

26. School districts willingly spend federal funds earmarked for arts programs. But when given the opportunity to choose, they usually select "the basics" or subject areas other than the arts that are experiencing budget pressures. One reason for this shift is that reading and mathematics scores are used to judge the overall adequacy of educational programs (and often are published in newspapers). Art is not generally assessed and there are few reliable standardized measures. Consequently, when the fiscal crunch is on, school districts cannot justify funding for the arts over other subject areas for which the district is accountable.

27. The Alliance for Arts Education was established in 1973. In 1975, the "Arts Advocacy Project" combined the political efforts of the four professional associations representing arts educators: the Music Educators National Conference (MENC), the National Art Education Association (NAEA), the National Dance Association (NDA), and the American Theatre Association (ATA). The Project solicited support from national

## Arts Education in Schools

Because budgets for the Endowment and state arts councils remained relatively stable during the 1970s and were cut during the Reagan presidency, arts advocates searched for new champions in the private sector. Frequently, they sought foundation support to bridge the funding gap or to initiate new programs. Some small local foundations rose to the occasion, including foundations formed for the express purpose of supporting magnet schools for the arts or trying to compensate for the inadequate provision for arts education in local school districts.<sup>28</sup>

### *IV. A Case Study of Foundation Involvement: The Getty Center for Education in the Arts*

The J. Paul Getty Trust emerged in the 1980s as a new supporter of arts education.<sup>29</sup> The Getty Trust, unlike most family and private foundations that are grant-making only, is an operating foundation. One of the operating programs of the Trust is the Getty Center for Education in the Arts, established in 1982 with the mission of improving the quality and status of arts education in elementary and secondary schools in the United States. In the early years the Center's activities have focused upon the visual arts for two reasons: the specific interest of the Trust's benefactor in the visual arts, and the belief that the Center could, by working in a single area of the arts, most effectively determine the processes and products that

---

educational organizations such as the National Elementary School Principals Association, the American Association of School Administrators, and the National School Boards Association. The National Coalition for Education in the Arts, which includes the American Council for the Arts, Young Audiences, Opera America, and other organizations, is currently leading an effort to forge a consensus for arts education policy-making and advocacy.

28. An example was the Alvarado School Workshop in San Francisco, which was a private effort supported by local foundations to offset the lack of art programs in schools. See A. Jepson & S. Litzky, *The Alvarado Experience: Ten Years of a School Community Art Program* (Alvarado School Art Workshop, 1978). The Rockefeller Brothers Fund sponsored the *Coming to Our Senses* report, *supra* note 16, and continued its support for arts education programs during this time through \$10,000 cash awards to American schools with exemplary art programs. The John D. Rockefeller 3rd Fund was another foundation supporter of arts education. With the death of John D. Rockefeller III, the foundation went out of business in 1979; this development was a severe blow to an arts education community with few foundation benefactors.

29. J. Paul Getty, who died in 1976, left his estate to the Getty Museum in Malibu, California. The Museum trustees, realizing that the legacy permitted them to make a greater contribution to the arts than could be made by the Museum alone, fashioned several operating entities oriented towards scholarship, conservation, and education in the visual arts and related humanities. For historical background and information about the various operating programs of the Trust, see The J. Paul Getty Trust, *Program Review, 1981-1985* (1985); The J. Paul Getty Trust, *Report, 1986-1988* (1988).

might have beneficial implications for the arts in education as a whole.

The Getty Center works in partnership with school districts, teacher education institutions, local and national arts and education organizations, government agencies, and diverse individual advocates for the furtherance of arts education in schools. It also relies on a wide coterie of advisors drawn from public schools, universities, museums, professional associations, and arts and education organizations. The Getty Center's approach to curriculum and instruction exemplifies its basic philosophy. The approach derives the content of the art lesson from the four art disciplines that are fundamental to creating, understanding, and appreciating works of art: art production (studio), art criticism, art history, and aesthetics. The Getty Center calls this approach "discipline-based art education" (DBAE), but similar approaches exist in the field of arts education and are known by such names as multifaceted art, comprehensive art, and curriculum-based art.<sup>30</sup> The DBAE approach underlies the Getty Center's five program and activity areas: *advocacy* for the role of art in education; *theory development* through the encouragement of scholarly work; *professional development* for teachers and administrators in schools and universities; *demonstration programs* of DBAE in classrooms; and *curriculum development* for DBAE.

The Getty Center's seven-year effort on behalf of arts education in the schools has had an impact primarily in two areas. First, it has acted as a catalyst for increasing dialogue and advocacy in the arts education field through publications, conferences, and projects.<sup>31</sup> Debate in the professional community has focused on both the content of art education and the identity of the educators.

Most state policymaking bodies officially endorse the multifaceted paradigm represented by DBAE; the National Art Education Association also supports the provision of a multi-dimensional program in

---

30. For a thorough description of discipline-based art education, see E. Eisner, *The Role of Discipline-Based Art Education in America's Schools* (The Getty Center for Education in the Arts, 1987).

31. For a sense of the Getty's outlook as it began to develop a national program, see *Beyond Creating: The Place for Art in America's Schools* (The Getty Center for Education in the Arts, 1985). Considerable literature in the field since 1985 has focused upon discipline-based art education and the Getty's role in the field. See Hamblen, *An Examination of Discipline-Based Art Education Issues*, 28:2 *Stud. in Art Educ.* 68 (Winter 1987). See generally 40:5 *Art Educ.* (Sept. 1987); 41:2 *Art Educ.* (Mar. 1988); 45:4 *Educ. Leadership* (Dec. 1987/Jan. 1988); 28:4 *Stud. in Art Educ.* (Summer 1987).

which studio art is only one of several components.<sup>32</sup> Yet there still exists in the professional arts education community some resistance to the shift away from an exclusive studio orientation with its particular focus on the child's own art works. In DBAE, children produce works of art; however, more attention is given to the study of mature artists and their works of art in order to acculturate students to the value of art in the adult world and in a societal context. The use of reproductions of art works and of excursions to museums to view original art are essential components of the DBAE approach and are advocated in virtually every state and district curriculum guide.

The other focus of the debate has been the question of who should deliver art instruction.<sup>33</sup> The Getty Center believes that art specialists, by virtue of educational background and experience, are in the best position to teach art in a compelling manner. Yet even the art specialist is likely to have an educational background that stresses studio skills with a token amount of art history, and he or she may not be well versed in all of the art disciplines from which the curriculum should be derived. Furthermore, since an art specialist usually spends only an hour or so a week with students, the general classroom teacher must be a collaborator to extend and reinforce what students learn in art. The recent Getty programs' focus on the needs and interests of art specialists has allayed apprehension that classroom teachers may become trained to deliver art instruction and that this development would undercut the specialists' position.<sup>34</sup>

---

32. See Visual and Performing Arts Framework, *supra* note 24. Advocacy publications of the National Art Education Association refer to "a written curriculum, K-12, that includes art history, art criticism, studio practice, and aesthetics." National Art Education Association, *Parents: A Quality Education Includes Art Education* (no date).

33. *Toward Civilization*, *supra* note 15, at 22-25. As this report points out, access to a visual art specialist is a regional phenomenon. In the Northeast, where the traditions of professional art schools are strong, school districts are much more likely to have art specialists at the elementary level than in a state like California, where Proposition 13 basically eliminated most specialist positions in the primary grades. Ca. Const. of 1879, art. XIII (1974); art. XIII A (1978).

34. For more information on the role of art specialists in DBAE, see K. Champlin, *The Roles of the Art Specialist in Discipline-Based Art Education*, in *Proceedings Reports: Roundtable Series II 95* (The Getty Center for Education in the Arts, 1988); M. Erickson, *The Roles of the Art Specialist in Discipline-Based Art Education*, in *Proceedings Reports: Roundtable Series II 103* (The Getty Center for Education in the Arts, 1988). Many art specialists participate in Getty-sponsored regional institutes which consist of consortia of school districts, teacher education institutions, and museums which fashion summer programs followed by activities conducted throughout the school year for professional development. The Getty Center's initiatives in teacher education institutions and in curriculum development also involve art specialists and address their concerns.

A second impact of the Center's work has been to help initiate efforts to strengthen arts education through partnerships with school districts, universities, and museums. For example, in Los Angeles County, 21 districts have been working for almost seven years with the Getty Institute for Educators on the Visual Arts, a research and development pilot project sponsored by the Getty Center, to provide professional development inservice programs for teachers in DBAE. More than 1,000 teachers in some 200 schools, with over 20,000 students, have been affected by this effort.<sup>35</sup>

The partnership theme is also pursued with such organizations as the Council for Basic Education, the National Parent-Teacher Association, the National Council for Chief State School Officers, and several dozen other important policymaking constituencies.<sup>36</sup> For example, the Getty Center is collaborating with the National Endowment for the Arts to develop television programs for children about the visual and performing arts. These programs are intended for home broadcast and will offer printed materials for home or classroom use. The intention is to use television to do for the arts what Sesame Street and other successful children's television programming have done for language development and arithmetic. Such private-public linkages illustrate how private sector support can facilitate the fulfillment of a public sector agenda in the field of arts education.

#### *V. Policy Issues and Recommendations for Private Foundation Support for Public Arts Education*

The involvement of private foundations such as the Getty Trust in arts education brings into focus three basic questions about the relationship between the private and public sectors in this area. First, will the substitution of private funds for public funds benefit arts

---

35. The background and early years of the Getty Institute are described in Greer & Rush, *A Grand Experiment: The Getty Institutes for Educators on the Visual Arts*, 37:1 *Art Educ.* 24 (Jan. 1985). A more recent report on the Institute is Greer & Silverman, *Making Art Important for Every Child*, 45:4 *Educ. Leadership* 10 (Dec. 1987/Jan. 1988). By summer 1990 the Institute will have completed its pilot project, and the Getty Center will publish a comprehensive seven-year report and a handbook for others interested in staff development and curriculum implementation of DBAE.

36. Getty Center initiatives involve partnerships with other public agencies, including dissemination projects with the National Diffusion Network (NDN) and the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) of the U.S. Department of Education; professional development institutes with the state departments of education in California and New York; and, the development of procedures and measures for art assessment with the National Arts Education Research Center at the University of Illinois (established by the N.E.A.).

education? Second, what are the internal limits on private sector support for arts education? And third, how can private and public sector interests best work together to achieve quality in arts education, and what policy guidelines might be followed for effective cooperation? The recommendations in this Article are informed by the general thesis that private foundations can do some things but cannot and should not do everything. The primary commitment must be made by public school authorities. If they agree that the arts are important in children's education, then they ought to provide for arts education. Private contributions should only complement and enrich such programs, not substitute for them.

### *A. The Effects of Substitution of Private Funds on the Public Sector*

The substitution of private funds for public funds is not peculiar to the arts.<sup>37</sup> In many areas of American life, private and volunteer organizations—including foundations, religious associations, and community self-help groups—have stepped in when public agencies have relinquished or abandoned responsibilities. This has happened in such areas as mental health, gifted and talented programs, and care of the aged. Indeed, one of the legacies of the “Reagan Revolution” is the premium on volunteerism and private sector involvement where government is hesitant (or cannot afford) to tread. President Bush encourages a similar socio-political ethos with his call for a “thousand points of light.”

There is a strong social and economic dimension to philanthropy that encourages private sector support for public causes. The tax laws have been designed to steer some private wealth into socially useful channels without resorting to outright taxation, which could be used to accomplish the same ends but would deprive the private source of choices that can be made to mutual benefit. Thus the contribution of a private foundation can match that of public agencies without assuming the full responsibility for burdens that otherwise would be assumed by government. Since taxing authority is highly decentralized by state legislatures and school districts around the country, such heterogeneity offers the opportunity for many variations in the private/public equation.<sup>38</sup>

---

37. For an incisive analysis of American cultural policy that neatly articulates the relations among the arts, culture, and education, see Lipman, *Cultural Policy: whither America, whither Government?* 3 *New Criterion* 7 (Nov. 1984).

38. California, with the largest population in the country, has about 1,000 school districts. Address by Bill Honig, California Superintendent of Education, California

Local and regional circumstances, such as the availability of foundation assistance in a particular community, may influence the public's opinion of who should bear responsibility for maintaining certain kinds of programs.<sup>39</sup> Too often the private foundation, especially a large one, may be seen as a "deep pocket" alternative when government funds are cut. By complementing and supplementing rather than replacing public support, foundations can still help to achieve the convergent purposes of the private and public sectors in the field of arts education. The goals of public agencies are echoed in the philosophical commitments of private foundations with interests in the arts; the public and private sectors both envision a citizenry educated in and appreciative of the arts, sensitive to and aware of the larger world and multicultural context, and prepared to become the audiences and consumers of culture in the future.<sup>40</sup>

The public sector faces long-term dangers when it moves towards increased private support. When private funds replace public funds, educational administrators and school boards abdicate their responsibility to provide for students at public expense. Cost-conscious school administrators can argue that when the budget axe falls on art and music programs, the private sector should pick up the pieces. However, in depending on such assistance, the schools shortchange their students. Even the best-intentioned private group is unlikely to adequately fund, with either financial resources, personnel, or material, the programs that professional educators, professional organizations, and local educational policymakers have decided should be provided in the general education curriculum. The dimensions of the system and the challenge are simply too large to rely heavily on the private sector. Furthermore, public agencies

---

Business Roundtable (March 9, 1989). But even smaller states can be highly decentralized. For example, Nebraska has only a fraction of California's population, but boasts over 900 school districts. Address by Sheila Brown, Art Director, State of Nebraska, Getty Regional Institutes Directors Meeting (Dec. 11, 1989).

39. An example of this is in Marin County, California, where the recently established Marin Community Foundation seeks to become a part of the fabric of social, educational, and cultural life in the county without assuming responsibilities and commitments which local and county governments have routinely accepted for maintaining services. Telephone interview with Douglas X. Patino, President of the Marin Community Foundation (May 10, 1989).

40. For example, the Toward Civilization report states that "the first purpose of arts education is to give our young people a sense of civilization." Toward Civilization, *supra* note 15, at 14. Compare the following language: "... the arts, often underfunded and neglected in public schools, can contribute substantially to the better understanding of the culture that surrounds us." Rockefeller Foundation, Helping Schools Work: Collaboratives for Humanities and Arts Teaching (CHART) 2 (1988).



should not be relieved of any portion of their educational responsibilities. If one part of the school curriculum is to depend ultimately upon privately-sponsored programs, other areas might also be relegated to the private sector.

Of equal concern is the issue of maintaining quality and equitable educational opportunity in school systems where the existence of an arts program might become primarily dependent upon private sector support. Such arrangements, in lieu of a regular and continuing commitment to the arts by the schools themselves, result in the frustration of student interests. Students should not be subjected to the vagaries of on-again, off-again programs, no matter how well-intentioned. Since a private group is not legally or fiscally bound to continue to support its arts education initiatives, schools must not allow themselves to become dependent upon potentially haphazard assistance. Furthermore, school administrators find it extremely difficult to plan for a coherent and continuous course of study if curricular decisions in art are made by persons outside the school system.

Ironically, private sector interests often are more concerned with promoting equal educational opportunity than are public agencies. Those who are privileged are often the first to recognize that the advantages of an arts education can be enjoyed by all students and should not be subject to the whims of school boards. The John D. Rockefeller 3rd Fund's theme of the 1970s emphasized "all the arts for all the children";<sup>41</sup> this theme remains implicit in the policies of the National Art Education Association and in the Getty Center's policies of working for the upgrading of art as a subject in general education for all students. Because this view has not been universally held, however, millions of youngsters are being denied equal educational opportunity in the arts.<sup>42</sup> As Laura Chapman has noted, access to art is often easier for those whose parents value art or can afford to provide special opportunities for learning about it. The aura of privilege and elitism that has sometimes been associated with the arts may be another reason that educators traditionally

---

41. See John D. Rockefeller 3rd Fund, *The Arts in Education: All the Arts . . . For All Our Children* (1969).

42. The law does not speak of arts education as an entitlement. In fact, the law at state levels varies considerably from one state to another as to what subjects are required in the curriculum. Local school boards remain the ultimate arbiters of what is taught. States now mandating a graduation requirement in the arts include Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Missouri, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Nevada, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, and West Virginia. Toward Civilization, *supra* note 15, at 20-21. However, such requirements are often generic and easily satisfied. *Id.* at 22.

neglect this area.<sup>43</sup> Compounding the access issue is the widely-held perception that the only students who really benefit from arts education are the "gifted and talented." By justifying access for only a segment of the school population through reliance on unevenly distributed private support, the opportunity for all children to enjoy and be enriched by the arts is limited.<sup>44</sup>

*B. Policy Limits on Private Sector Support for Arts Education*

Private sector support for arts education in schools is limited in several obvious ways. First, the huge funding requirements of such programs make it unlikely that even a coalition of all the private foundations interested in this area could finance and support the necessary changes. There are 46 million students in America's 109,000 elementary and secondary schools.<sup>45</sup> The \$308 billion that is currently expended yearly on education at all levels (elementary, secondary and postsecondary) of our society is 7% of the Gross National Product.<sup>46</sup> Given such numbers, no foundation, even in alliance with others, could undertake to regularly train personnel, supply curriculum, or carry out other support functions for the arts or any other subject area. Such functions are the proper province of public authorities with commensurate resources.

A second limitation on private sector support is that non-profit organizations work under a very different governance structure than do public bodies. A private operating foundation need not make decisions based upon public opinion or special interest group pressure, to which legislators and school boards are necessarily sensitive. One writer suggests that "democratic pluralism in art can be threatened" by the fact that "philanthropic funding shapes programs, dictates needs, and supplies judgments of value."<sup>47</sup> The public does not elect the trustees and officers of private foundations, and these trustees and officers do not have to defend their decisions in public as do legislators and many school boards. Private foundations are free to finance what they believe deserves their attention,

---

43. L. Chapman, *Instant Art, Instant Culture: The Unspoken Policy for American Schools* 127 (1982).

44. For a review of state programs designed to meet the needs of artistically talented students, see G. Clark & E. Zimmerman, *Educating Artistically Talented Students* chs. 4,5 (1984).

45. National Center for Education Statistics, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Dept. of Education, *American Education At A Glance* (1988).

46. *Id.*

47. Hamblen, *Philanthropies in Art Education: An Uneasy Peace*, 88:4 *Design for Arts in Educ.* 23, 26 (Mar./Apr. 1987).

whether or not support is forthcoming from other sources. Although such latitude may be offset by the fact that choices are often determined by a board of directors attempting to represent (in an often undefined fashion) the "community interest," this is still a "limitation" to those who disagree with a foundation's policies and the direction it takes in its funding.

A third limitation on private sector support for arts education in schools is the permanent commitment school systems require to adequately establish and maintain arts programs. Although some foundations have made clear their willingness to work in a given program area over the long term, there is nothing that obligates them to do so. However, the institutionalization of change within the schools is necessary for arts education to assume its rightful role. To consolidate a place in the curriculum for art requires the establishment of budget lines that support, for example, professional development programs, curriculum materials, and sufficient instructional time in art. The private sector is reluctant to guarantee such resources indefinitely, generally preferring to "seed" a project, establish a framework of private sector support, and then move on. The alternative for private foundations would be to imitate the government, which is committed to a private sector version of "entitlement programs" with diminishing flexibility over time.

Fortunately, however, not all foundation grants are short-term. For example, some of the various Rockefeller foundations have supported arts education for decades. The commitment of the Getty Trust to arts education has also been designed for the long term.<sup>48</sup> However, in offering this commitment, these foundations expect that their assistance will be only a catalyst for permanent change through research and development, demonstration programs and pilot projects. In addition, foundations cherish the opportunity to provide a flexible response as educational needs evolve. If a permanent commitment has been made to one problem or issue area, the ability of a foundation to take other initiatives may be compromised.<sup>49</sup>

---

48. See Duke, *The Getty Center for Education in the Arts: A Progress Report*, Phi Delta Kappan 443 (Feb. 1988).

49. Both the opportunity and responsibility of a private foundation are summarized in a statement by the President and Chief Executive Officer of the J. Paul Getty Trust: "Government grant making tends to be populist, broad-based, and often short-term in its approach. Corporate and individual giving tends to be episodic and to further the specific interests of the individual or the chief executive and the public relations interests of the corporation. It is the private foundation that is unique in its flexibility and

The public sector must allow and expect foundations to assume the role of effecting partnerships that will advance the field, without assuming direct or permanent responsibility for the establishment and maintenance of art programs. This limited role for the foundation is less than some would prefer, but it is important that a non-profit organization avoid crossing the line into assuming operating expenses and policymaking, which are public responsibilities.

*C. Defining the Roles of the Public and Private Sectors*

The third and final policy issue to be addressed here is that of determining how private and public sector interests can best work together. Ralph Smith has suggested that "we should not distinguish too sharply between the public and private sectors."<sup>50</sup> John Dewey emphasized that when the public sector devalues an interest, and private citizens and groups organize on behalf of that interest, the private sector becomes a policymaking entity whose efforts influence elected officials and represent a focus for public pressure as well as a substitute for action by public sector agencies.<sup>51</sup> Nevertheless, the private sector's role must be a limited one. Even the Getty Trust, one of the largest private foundations in the country, considers few if any commitments entitled to a permanent claim on the foundation's priorities and resources.

On the other hand, nonprofit organizations can create partnerships and alliances with public groups and government entities that will leverage the ability of nonprofits to provide proportionate and measured support for focused interests. The Getty Trust is a case study of what might be accomplished when a private operating foundation makes a continuing commitment, as has been made by the Carnegie Endowment to public education, the Ford Foundation to performing arts and educational television, and the Rockefeller Foundation to medical research. Projects which cast a wide net in both impact and outcome are obviously the most desirable. At the same time, it is an undesirable precedent for private sponsors to pay for the institutionalization and maintenance of programs, rather

---

autonomy and has the potential of thinking long-term, establishing goals, focusing resources, and taking risks. It is, then, the responsibility of the private foundation to search for the interstices where the vision and impact of other forms of philanthropic activity are not likely to be felt." Williams, *Philanthropy and Art Education: The Role of the Private Foundation*, 88:4 *Design for Arts in Educ.* 12, 14 (Mar./Apr. 1987).

50. Smith, *supra* note 20, at 7.

51. J. Dewey, *The Public and Its Problems* (1927).

## Arts Education in Schools

than to nurture change through cooperative research and development, new initiatives and matching incentive programs. To do otherwise is to lock the private sector into an unlimited share of public responsibility.

The strategy of cooperation and networking is now being practiced in the field of arts education to a greater degree than ever before. Arts educators actively seek out the opinions and endorsements of educators across the spectrum of educational policymaking organizations.<sup>52</sup> The Getty Center has formed several partnerships with public agencies that illustrate how the relative roles and responsibilities of each side can be maintained. For example, the Center's grants to consortia are on a matching basis; over the five-year cycle of support, the foundation's role gradually diminishes while that of the consortia expands.<sup>53</sup> As a matter of policy, the institutionalization of arts programs has been built into these partnerships, so that the success of the project and the continuation of funding depend upon defined and expected progress in establishing a permanent program.

The Getty Center's experience illustrates some useful policy guidelines for a private foundation in developing partnerships with the public sector in the field of arts education. First, the public sector must demonstrate its support in order to obtain private funds. This support is perhaps best indicated by the interest and involvement of school board members, superintendents, and principals. Involvement of such personnel is an essential component in the Getty model for staff development and curriculum implementation in art; special sessions are held for these policymakers, and their participation is required. Their involvement is based upon the perception that teachers will take most seriously that which their administrators think and say is important. To circumvent the usual rhetorical subterfuges of vocally supporting the arts but failing to back programs with administrative and fiscal muscle, the Getty Center involves administrators in the on-going planning process. No one will be surprised to hear that evaluations of the efficiency of these inservice

---

52. For example, the Executive Director of the National Association of Secondary School Principals states that his organization "believes in and supports a strong presence of the arts in the high schools and junior high schools and middle schools of the nation." Thompson, *Forum: Arts Education and the K-12 Policy Complex*, 89:3 *Design for Arts in Educ.* 15 (Jan./Feb. 1988).

53. Consortia sponsored by the Getty Center have been established in Florida, Minnesota, Nebraska, Ohio, Tennessee, and Texas. Non-Getty-sponsored consortia may also be found around the country in such places as California (San Francisco), Michigan (Wayne County), and Pennsylvania (Allentown).

programs for teaching art show much higher teacher interest and activity when the principal is perceived as being behind the program.<sup>54</sup> There are even examples of principals going into the classroom and teaching an art lesson, a virtually unprecedented demonstration of educational leadership.<sup>55</sup>

A second policy guideline developed from the Getty Center's experience is that the commitment of the public entity (a school district, for instance) should be on a systemic or district-wide basis. Too often a "pilot" or showpiece school makes substantial progress, but there is no extrapolation to other schools, even those in the same district. Dissemination of theory and practice is likely to be more efficient when there is first-hand, first-generation participation in the experience. The Getty Center argues that in order for art to become a meaningful part of a student's general education, the art program must be in place throughout all grades. This helps ensure coherence and continuity as students move through the system.<sup>56</sup>

A third significant policy directive is to refrain from endorsing a particular curriculum or set of instructional materials to achieve the purposes of a multifaceted or DBAE. Since DBAE is not a curriculum but a conceptual approach, it can be expected to develop in many versions. Some commercial publishers who are responsive to the potential market for arts education in school districts will no doubt capitalize upon the DBAE momentum. But the Getty Center is unlikely to select and endorse a specific product given the diverse needs, circumstances and resources of potential users. Although the commercial publishers are the only ones with the capital, marketing, and distribution systems to actually produce instructional materials for thousands of schools, it is probable that there will always be districts that choose to create their own curricula in the arts, using locally generated lessons and resources. Such curricula enable a district to tailor the DBAE approach in an idiosyncratic manner. In a pluralistic and diverse nation the philosophical and policy appeal of such a position is self-evident. Educational history also lends credence to this position, as few curriculum development

---

54. For example, in the program known as the Getty Institute for Educators on the Visual Arts, the pilot project with 21 Los Angeles school districts, the school team responsible for professional development and curriculum implementation in discipline-based art education must include the principal as well as teachers.

55. See Eisner, *The Principal's Role in Arts Education*, Principal 6 (Jan. 1988).

56. For a criticism of the district-wide policy, see Jackson, *Mainstreaming Art: An Essay on Discipline-Based Art Education*, 16:6 Educ. Researcher 39 (Aug./Sept. 1987). See the reply to Jackson in Eisner, *Discipline-Based Art Education: A Reply to Philip Jackson*, 16:9 Educ. Researcher 50 (Dec. 1987).

movements over the past 25 years have been effective with all of their intended audiences.<sup>57</sup>

## VI. Conclusion

The Getty Center's commitment provides a hopeful outlook for private and public interests to continue to work together to establish and promote the arts in schools. However, it must be reiterated that such partnerships should acknowledge the various dangers and limitations of using private support to fulfill public responsibilities.

As Ralph Smith says, "When art is understood not only as a source of enjoyable experience but also as the communicator of values and knowledge, it can be accommodated to the purposes of traditional liberal education. . . ." <sup>58</sup> The continual building of networks among those with a stake in arts education should ultimately consolidate the influence of arts advocates and engender greater rewards in the field. For example, art educators in schools are increasingly turning their attention to their relationships with art museums. Art museums have recently undergone a period of intense professional introspection concerning their educational role, including provision for schools, which should eventually create new and effective partnerships.<sup>59</sup>

Foundations and other private supporters of the arts in the nation's educational system will continue to have an impact as long as they are allowed and expected to play only a limited role in the pursuit of realistic policies that acknowledge the size, pluralism, and idiosyncrasy of American schools. They should work with public agencies to improve the attitudes of educational policymakers about arts education. For either the private or the public sector to do less is to forfeit the opportunity to help make our schools and their curricula life-enhancing for all of our children.

---

57. Some of the most highly touted curriculum development movements, such as the "new math," failed to account for differences of instructional approach, cognitive learning styles, and the rapidly changing demographics of the American classroom.

58. Smith, *supra* note 20, at 3.

59. See, e.g., Commission on Museums for a New Century, American Association of Museums, *Museums for a New Century* 66-69 (1984); E. Eisner & S. Dobbs, *The Uncertain Profession: Observations on the State of Museum Education in Twenty American Art Museums* (The Getty Center for Education in the Arts, 1986).